Meeting Notes

Design Guidelines Focus Group Meeting

3:00 p.m. – Wednesday, June 17, 2009
Cherry Bldg Conference Room, 101 West Cherry Ave, Flagstaff, AZ

1. Welcome and Introductions

   <u>In attendance:</u>

   Steve Dorsett, Architect
   Ryan Smith, Architect, Shapes and Forms
   Will Freund, Architect
   Aude Stang, Architectural Designer (Vice Chair)
   Steve Tegethoff, Architect
   Daniel Paduchowski, Architect (Chair)
   Paul Moore, Architect
   Mark Sawyers, City of Flagstaff
   Edwin Larsen, City of Flagstaff
   Darrel Barker, City of Flagstaff
   Roger Eastman, City of Flagstaff
   Elaine Averitt, City of Flagstaff
   Dennis Dixon, Contractor

2. Focus Group Overview

   Daniel (Chair) gave and introduction, went around the room for a couple of new faces and restated the purpose of the focus group. Daniel outlined the ground rules for behavior and sharing of ideas among the various participants. He also invited Roger Eastman to provide the Transect briefing and a short video after the group works on the matrix (attached).

3. Discussion items:

   One of the "home work" assignments that hadn't been done, but needs to be completed before the next meeting was to take those items that the group would move into the "new" or "further discussion" columns and prioritize the top five. It was agreed that if this information could be sent to Roger Eastman or Ed Larsen, we would tally the results and have them ready for the next meeting.

   During the discussion of the key issues, it was agreed that the entire topic of "standards versus guidelines" could really be broken into two separate topics

and should be added for further discussion. It was noted that the current Land Development Code lacked a good pattern book or samples for designers of what was desired. The issue of the character of Flagstaff (which needs more discussion) was going to have as a critical component a pattern book for all designers to use as a reference or starting point.

When it was brought up as a key issue about needing revisions to Design Guidelines, not just a rewrite, it was obvious that a lot of interest was expressed by the group.

Since the Regional Plan is more of a policy document, some of the images of Flagstaff or what is traditionally Flagstaff topics seemed to border on being a policy document issue. The group did decide that certain items should be handed off to other groups (see chart) and needed to be coordinated between the Regional Plan writing group and the Chairs of the Focus Groups.

Not clearly shown as a key issue, but some time was spent on the roles of Architects (we had six of them at this meeting) and the roles of Planners and Civil Engineers. There seemed to be a lot of concern about who provides the architecture or form of the building. This had a large impact to the process and procedures focus group since often the entitlement stage or civil engineering, the plans were done before the Architect was involved. [We heard a similar comment from the Landscape group from our one and only Landscape Architect].

There was some discussion about cost implications and whether or not that belonged in a zoning code. Some of the issues seemed to be that when the planner asked for more specifics (such as rock cladding) to be added, that the applicant may not understand what that does to the square footage costs for the building. Another group thought that costs were also high initially when the planning portion of the Development Review Board couldn't provide the developer a feasibility analysis without elevations and architectural drawings for the project; which often costs the developers thousands of dollars in seed money for a "no" answer.

4.   Next meeting
      July 2, 2009 at 3:00 for 1.5 hours

5.   Adjournment
      4:35 p.m.

Design Guidelines Focus Group Meeting
Summary Notes – June 17, 2009

RESOLVED ISSUES	FURTHER DISCUSSION
Code that is easy to use and apply – user friendly to citizens and developers (create a sample user). Test with users.	Standards versus guidelines Decide whether to call them guidelines or standards?

Standards versus guidelines
  Remove standards from chapter 16
	How to yield good design?
	  How to balance good design with the need for regulations?

Need images showing what is desired as appropriate design – pattern book	Design Review Board – Citizen & staff/peer review to deal with discretion in design
Do we need Design Guidelines? YES Revise rather than rewrite.	Define Flagstaff design tradition. What does historic character really mean? Define. Abstract forms and design elements rather than mimic historic/arch. Vernacular Common theme but unique character districts "Funky, simple architecture"
Efficient/quick design review process	"Whiners' escape"? – if you whine long enough you will get want you want! Should it be allowed?
Create a code review schedule every X years	List strengths and weaknesses from each member
Refine submittal requirements and process. Concept to final. Two-step process or three-step process with pre-application meeting?	Resource requirements conflict with and obscure well designed buildings i.e. possibly reduce tree resource stds. To allow buildings to be seen?
	What is the role of design review? Design is more than aesthetics – context, comfort, etc
	Also Process and Procedures group - How to address design as a continuous process? (minor modifications through the process) Last minute changes an issue - does it change the character of the design?
	Cost implications – add current cost indices into the design guidelines
	Technology advances – Green building/ LEED, etc.. Also its implications to design that may not be pure "Flagstaff". Require or encourage "Green"?

	But it is more than just buildings – think about site, block, neighborhood design.
	Engineering standards dominate – more relaxed standards based on context
	Requirement for licensed architect – thresholds?
	Transect and Form Based Code
NOT APPLICABLE	**NEW ITEMS**
Process and procedures group needs to codify pre-appl. meeting process into new code	
Great idea – transect based engineering standards?	
Process and procedures group - Cross certification between design professionals on a project. Promote better communication between professionals.	
NAU – we cannot regulated NAU	